DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 134 130 HE 008 628

AUTHOR Guion, Robert; And Others
TITLE Student Evaluation of Teaching: A Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Study the Current Uses of and Faculty Attitudes Toward Student Evaluation of Teachers and Courses at Bowling Green State University (BGSU).
PUB DATE Feb 77
NOTE 41p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Personnel; Committees; *Course Evaluation; Decision Making; Department Directors (School); Evaluation Methods; Higher Education; *Instructional Improvement; Personnel Evaluation; Policy Formation; Questionnaires; *Rating Scales; *Student Evaluation of Teacher Performance; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Rating
IDENTIFIERS *Bowling Green State University; Department Chairpersons

ABSTRACT

Department chairpersons, college deans, and members of college-level personnel committees at Bowling Green State University (BGSU) were interviewed concerning their use of procedures by which college students measure or evaluate teaching, teachers, and classes. All regular teaching faculty at BGSU and associated administrators also were asked to complete a questionnaire concerning their attitudes toward and uses of student evaluation of teaching. The responses to the interviews and to the questionnaires that: (1) a wide variety of student ratings forms and departmental policies concerning their use now exists at BGSU; (2) faculty and administrator attitudes toward student ratings forms and procedures vary widely; (3) faculty prefer to use student ratings data for instructional improvement rather than as a basis for personnel decision-making; and (4) the mandatory use of university-wide or college-wide student ratings procedures is strongly opposed by a majority of the 420 faculty and staff who responded to the questionnaire. (Author/LBH)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED134130

STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHING:

A Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Study the Current Uses of and Faculty Attitudes Towards Student Evaluation of Teachers and Courses at Bowling Green State University (BGSU)

Robert Guion, Psychology Department
Peter Hutchinson, Economics Department
Thomas Klein, English Department
Joyce Statz, Computer Science Department
Peter Wood, Educational Foundations & Inquiry, Committee Chair

Bowling Green State University

February, 1977

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE008628

Abstract

Department chairpersons, college deans, and members of college-level personnel committees at BGSU were interviewed concerning their use of procedures by which college students measure or evaluate teaching, teachers, and classes. All regular teaching faculty at BGSU (and associated administrators) also were asked to complete a questionnaire concerning their attitudes toward and uses of student evaluation of teaching. The responses to the interviews and to the questionnaires indicated that: 1) a wide variety of student ratings forms and departmental policies concerning use of these forms now exists at BGSU; 2) faculty and administrator attitudes towards student ratings forms and procedures also varies widely; 3) faculty much prefer to use student ratings data for instructional improvement rather than as a basis for personnel decision making; and 4) the mandatory use of university-wide or college-wide student ratings procedures is strongly opposed by a majority of the 420 faculty and staff who responded to the questionnaire.

Report
of
Ad Hoc Committee to Study
The Present Uses and Varieties
of Student Evaluations

During the late spring term of 1975, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee created an ad hoc committee to determine: (1) the current faculty and administrative uses of student ratings at BGSU; and (2) the faculty attitudes towards the use of student ratings of classroom teaching.

The final report of this committee consists of the following sections:

I. A narrative description of current uses of student ratings, derived from interviews with department chairpersons and college personnel committees;

II. A narrative and numerical description of faculty uses of and attitudes toward student ratings, derived from a questionnaire mailed to BGSU faculty;

III. A summary commentary, with recommendations, based upon the information gathered; and

IV. A set of appendices which include the forms used and various illustrative materials.

I. A SUMMARY OF CURRENT USES OF STUDENT RATINGS

Introduction

The information contained in this section of the report was gathered through a series of in-depth interviews with department chairpersons during the summer and fall quarters of 1975. The Committee has chosen to write a narrative report rather than to submit a numerical report with ambiguous data and questionable interpretations. The basic role of this section of the report is informational; a later section will present commentary on uses of evaluations. The primary purposes of this section are to summarize the information which was obtained in the interviews, and to describe the similarities and dissimilarities in the chairpersons' responses.

Student Evaluation Forms in Use

There is a wide range of student evaluation instruments used throughout the University. These instruments consist of essentially three types: A) computer-scored forms containing a series of "multiple-choice" questions; B) anecdotal forms containing the students' written responses to one or more general questions; C) combination forms containing elements of both the computer-scored and anecdotal forms. Combination forms seem to be the most popular. In those cases where no specific anecdotal questions are asked, students are usually free to make general comments on the back of the answer sheets. Most student evaluation forms are anonymous, although some are signed by students.

Most of the questionnaires contain summary information in one form or another. The computer-scored forms provide the faculty member with numerical summary information such as mean response, standard deviation, and response distributions for each question. Many also provide a summary number describing

the students' mean response to a question concerning the instructor's overall teaching ability. This summary number frequently becomes part of the faculty member's personnel file.

Although the form developed by Peter Wood (EDFI) seems to be widely used (10-20% of total usage), most departments use their "own form." The meaning of the phrase "own form" varies, however. In many cases it means a form developed by the department or by a departmental committee. In other cases it means a form developed specifically by individual instructors for use in their own courses. A third option is the form previously used by the College of Business Administration. At the time of the interview, Business used a form which was developed by an ad hoc committee of College faculty, approved by the College faculty as a whole, and administered in a uniform fashion on a College-wide basis. The mandatory use of this common form has been discontinued, but the form is still available for use by individuals or departments.

Faculty Obligation to Use Student Evaluation Forms

There was no common response on this matter. Some departments do not mandate the use of student evaluations. This does not mean, however, that none of the faculty in these departments administers them. Many professors in these departments administer evaluations, use them for diagnostic purposes, and submit them as documentary evidence in salary, promotion, and tenure decisions.

In other departments the faculty are obligated to administer student evaluations, but the extent of this obligation varies rather widely. Several examples may illustrate this point. Some departments require all faculty to administer the same form and to submit the results to the

chairperson. In other departments this obligation pertains only to probationary faculty. In still other departments the faculty are obligated to administer the forms but are under no obligation to show them to anyone. There are also cases in which the faculty are obligated to administer the forms but may themselves choose which student responses to submit to the chairperson.

Administrative Procedures

There is a good deal of commonality concerning the manner in which student evaluations are administered. The most common practice consists of the faculty member giving the forms to a student monitor who distributes, collects, and returns the forms to the chairperson's office. However, there are several variations of this procedure. In some cases the forms are administered during the last week of class, and in others they are distributed with the final exams. Also, in some departments there is a strict policy prohibiting the faculty member from making prefatory remarks to the students, while in other departments there is no policy on such prefatory statements. In at least one department, the chairman or his designate administers the forms.

Access to the Results

There are wide discrepancies throughout the University concerning who sees the results of student evaluations. In virtually all cases the faculty themselves receive the original forms containing student responses. They usually receive a summary sheet, as well, if computer-scored forms are used. In some cases, however, the instructor does not receive this information until the end of the school year. This may make it extremely difficult to use the information for diagnostic purposes. In most cases the information is also seen by the chairperson, in either its raw form or summary form.

Beyond that, however, divergences appear. The promotion and tenure committees of most departments have access to the information on an ad hoc basis when the faculty member is being considered for promotion and tenure. In some departments this consists strictly of access to a numerical summary as one part of the faculty member's service report. In others it consists of access to the actual forms themselves. Where salary committees exist within departments, the same procedure is followed. Also, some student evaluation information is usually contained as part of the documentary evidence presented to the Dean and the college personnel committees when promotion and tenure decisions are being made. Some departments inform all faculty of the mean rating scores of all other faculty, while in other departments these data are provided without individual faculty identification to allow faculty members the privilege of ranking their own performances. Departmental secretaries who type the summary information also have access to the data.

Weight of the Teaching Component Among Research, Teaching, and Service

There was no consistent level of response concerning the weight of teaching among teaching, research and service. In some departments, teaching accounted for 100% of the total responsibilities of the faculty members. Among other departments it ranged from 20 to about 50%. In one department, the estimate was 36%. In another department, the faculty member could adjust the weight given to teaching by taking on a larger course load.

Weight of the Student Evaluation in Evaluating the Teaching Component

Since some departments currently use no student evaluations, the lowest weight was 0%. Where weights were in fact assigned, they varied

from 5% to 60% in determining the quality of teaching. In most cases, other information for evaluating teaching came from peer evaluations, informal student contact, evidence of innovative teaching, and curriculum development. Many chairpersons said that student evaluations were used to validate other impressions or to make a decision when other evidence was neither definitely positive nor definitely negative.

Chairperson's Perception of Faculty Satisfaction with Forms

As in previous questions, there was no clear common response. Impressions varied from "most faculty in the department favor dropping use of student evaluations" to "most would like to use them only for personal development of teaching" to "everyone throughout the University should be required to use student evaluation forms." Most chairpersons thought that faculty were, at best, uneasy about the reliability and validity of student evaluations being used for personnel decisions. Faculty were thought to want student input for their own improvement, though, and probably gained good information, especially from anecdotal forms.

While most chairpersons had some opinion about the faculty's satisfaction, some of these opinions clearly did not accurately reflect the opinions of the faculty. In the College of Business Administration, for example, chairpersons (with one exception) thought that faculty were generally in favor of student evaluations for their own purposes, and that about half of them were in favor of their use for salary, promotion and tenure purposes. Yet, when the College voted on whether or not to continue using student evaluation ratings, the faculty voted with a 2 to 1 majority to eliminate the obligatory use of mandatory student ratings.

Chairperson's Perception of Purposes and Effectiveness of Evaluations

For many departments, the forms serve the purpose of answering the needs of department, college, and university personnel committees. While some departments would rather not deal with numerical summaries, they provide such summaries at the request of promotion and tenure committees.

Several chairpersons commented that student ratings were useful in discriminating among faculty at the extreme top and bottom of the scale, though they usually were little help in stratifying the middle range of teaching ability. Some chairpersons believe that ratings data has potential counseling value, though little use is made of this function. In some cases, the forms provided only impressionistic data, from which the chairperson sought clarification using other information.

Miscellaneous Comments

Several chairpersons suggested that students sign their evaluation forms, in an attempt to have more responsible use of the forms. Advantages of such a system include the elimination of random or flippant comments and the ability to follow-up a comment for clarification. Some disadvantages in the minds of students might be a fear of reprisal (in this course or future courses), and a shyness about saying something positive or negative under signature.

There was an almost even split in opinion about whether or not the ratings were related to grade inflation. There were those who thought of student rating forms as popularity contests, with professors giving better grades, less work, or some other inducement for earning high ratings. (Most who included this comment were quick to include that none of their faculty, of course, ever did such things!). On the other hand, many saw no

relationship between grades and ratings, trusting the faculty to rise above such a temptation.

II. RESULTS FROM A QUESTIONNAIRE CONCERNING STUDENT RATINGS OF TEACHERS

Four hundred and twenty of 650 BGSU faculty and staff, and sixteen administrators of Ohio two-year colleges responded to a fifty-five item questionnaire intended to elicit their attitudes toward and uses of student ratings of teaching. Ten other faculty or staff returned blank questionnaires with reasons for not responding to the form. All responses have been stored for possible future use.

The Questionnaire

The first fourteen questions dealt with the background of the respondents: department, college, rank, administrative status, tenure status, and distribution of time to the functions of teaching, research, and service. Ten other questions related to how respondents would wish these functions to be evaluated, and seven items dealt directly with the types of student rating questionnaires that have been used or should be used by faculty. The remaining twenty-four items were statements about attitudes toward student ratings. Respondents were asked to indicate their agreement with these statements by using a four-point scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (4). These twenty-four statements and their response distributions, mean responses, and response standard deviations are presented in Table 1.

TABLE 1

Faculty and Staff Opinions Concerning
Student Ratings of Instruction (N=436)

Items	Percentage of Response						
	Strongly Disagree			Strongly Agree			
	1	2	3	4	OMIT	X	SD
1. I favor a university-wide mandatory student ratings system. .	47.2	18.6	16.1	15.1	2.3	2.0	1.14
2. I favor a college-wide, mandatory student ratings system . .	41.7	20.6	18.8	15.4	3.4	2.1	1.12
3. I favor a department-wide, mandatory student ratings system . .	32.6	18.3	22.9	22.5	3.7	2.4	1.17
4. Decisions concerning the use of student ratings should be made solely by the individual departments	20.4	23.6	28.0	24.8	3.2	2.6	1.09
5. Decisions concerning the use of student ratings should be made solely by individual faculty .	24.5	28.4	17.2	25.7	4.1	2.46	1.14
6. I am satisfied with the present use of student ratings	37.4	31.0	20.0	5.0	6.7	1.9	0.91
7. I find that student ratings assist me to assess and improve my teaching	14.4	16.1	43.1	22.2	4.1	2.8	0.97
8. Only numerical data derived from student ratings should be provided to personnel committees	42.7	30.5	16.5	5.7	4.6	1.8	0.92
9. Only anecdotal information derived from student ratings should be provided to personnel committees	45.2	36.9	10.6	2.1	5.3	1.7	0.76
10. Student ratings data are not weighted heavily enough in making most personnel decisions	32.2	33.9	17.4	7.3	8.9	1.99	0.93

TABLE 1 (continued)

Items	Percentage of Response						
	Strongly Disagree			Strongly Agree			
	1	2	3	4	OMIT	$\bar{X}$	SD
11. Students are the best judges of classroom instruction	42.7	33.9	15.8	4.6	3.0	1.82	0.87
12. Student ratings are <u>not</u> valid measures of classroom teaching competence	15.1	31.7	22.5	26.6	4.1	2.6	1.05
13. Student ratings should <u>not</u> be used to determine faculty dismissal	7.3	28.9	27.8	31.7	4.4	2.88	0.96
14. I would favor mandatory student ratings if validity could be demonstrated	8.9	15.8	42.0	28.0	5.3	2.9	0.92
15. Student ratings are valid when supplemented by other sources of data	7.3	18.8	45.6	23.6	4.6	2.9	0.86
16. Student ratings are valid only when signed by students	25.9	43.6	18.3	6.4	5.7	2.1	0.86
17. Student ratings <u>are now used</u> to inform students about teacher or course characteristics	25.5	36.9	15.1	3.0	19.5	1.95	0.81
18. Student ratings <u>should be</u> used to inform students about teacher/course characteristics	25.7	31.2	26.8	8.0	8.3	2.2	0.94
19. Student ratings <u>are now</u> used for teacher self-improvement. . . .	12.6	25.9	47.0	7.3	7.1	2.5	0.83
20. Student ratings <u>should be</u> used for teacher self-improvement. .	5.0	3.9	43.1	45.2	2.8	3.3	0.78
21. Student ratings <u>are now</u> used to assist chairpersons (or others) to assist teachers	22.7	36.5	28.7	2.1	10.1	2.1	0.81

TABLE 1 (continued)

Items	Percentage of Response						
	Strongly Disagree			Strongly Agree			
	1	2	3	4	OMIT	$\bar{X}$	SD
22. Student ratings should be used to assist chairpersons (or others) to assist teachers . .	8.7	11.2	53.0	22.7	4.4	2.9	0.85
23. Student ratings are now used as a necessary component of personnel decisions	7.6	22.2	41.7	14.7	13.8	2.7	0.84
24. Student ratings should be used as a necessary component of personnel decisions	17.9	20.6	40.4	15.6	5.5	2.6	0.98

Results--Summary of Attitudes

The use of a college-wide or university-wide mandatory student ratings system seems to produce strong disagreement--as does the reporting of only anecdotal or only numerical data. Disagreement with a mandatory department-wide student rating system is very slight; in fact, there is slight agreement that departments should decide on the use of ratings. Furthermore, Question #15 reveals that there is fairly strong agreement that ratings are valid when supplemented by other sources of data. Responses to question #24 suggests that most faculty (59.2%) believe ratings should be used as a necessary component of personnel decisions. However, the most favored use of student ratings seems to lie in the area of faculty self-improvement rather than as a measure of comparative faculty effectiveness to be employed for personnel decisions.

Apparently, student ratings are not frequently used in their third common function--to inform students concerning teacher or course characteristics--

and this function does not seem to draw a strong support from faculty and staff.

Results--Strong Disagreement

More than forty percent of the respondents STRONGLY DISAGREED with the first five statements listed in Table #2. The remaining four statements (#6, 10, 16, 17) did not elicit such a strong response but did produce a total disagreement from more than seventy percent of those who responded to the questionnaire.*

TABLE 2

Statements Which Elicited Strong Disagreement

Items	Percentage of Response		
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Total Disagreement*
1. I favor a university-wide, mandatory student ratings system	47.2	18.6	67
9. Only anecdotal information derived from student ratings should be provided to personnel committees. .	43.2	36.9	86.7
8. Only numerical data derived from student ratings should be provided to personnel committees	42.7	30.5	76.7
11. Students are the best judges of classroom instruction	42.7	33.9	79.0
2. I favor a college-wide, mandatory student ratings system	41.7	20.6	64

TABLE 2 (continued)

Items	Percentage of Response		
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Total Disagreement*
17. Student ratings are now used to inform students about teacher or course characteristics	25.5	36.9	77.5
6. I am satisfied with the present use of student ratings	37.4	31.0	73.2
16. Student ratings are valid only when signed by students	25.9	43.6	73.7
10. Student ratings are not weighted heavily enough in making most personnel decisions	32.3	33.9	72.8

*The percentages in these columns are calculated by excluding all of those who omitted the question.

Results -- Milder Disagreement

Over fifty percent of those who responded STRONGLY DISAGREED or DISAGREED with the four statements listed in Table #3 -- although the disagreement was less marked than with the statements presented on the preceding page in Table #2.

TABLE 3

Statements Which Elicited Milder Disagreement

Items	Percentage of Response		
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Total Disagreement*
21. Student ratings are now used to assist chairpersons (or others) to assist teachers	25.3	40.6	65.8
18. Student ratings should be used to inform students about teacher/ course characteristics	28.0	34.0	62.0

TABLE 3 (continued)

Items	Percentage of Response		
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Total Disagreement*
5. Decisions concerning the use of student ratings should be made solely by individual faculty . .	25.5	29.6	55.0
3. I favor a department-wide, mandatory student ratings system . .	33.9	19.0	53.0

*The percentages in these columns are calculated by excluding all who omitted the question.

Results — Mild Agreement

Between one half and two-thirds of those who responded AGREED of STRONGLY AGREED with the six statements listed in Table #4.

TABLE 4

Items	Percentage of Response		
	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total Agreement
12. Student ratings are not valid measures of classroom teaching competence	23.5	27.7	51.2
4. Decisions concerning the use of student ratings should be made solely by the individual departments	28.9	25.6	55.0
19. Student ratings are now used for teacher self-improvement .	50.6	7.9	58.5
24. Student ratings should be used as a necessary component of personnel decisions	42.8	16.5	59.2
13. Student ratings should not be used to determine faculty dismissal	29.1	33.2	62.1
23. Student ratings are now used as a necessary component of personnel decisions	48.4	17.1	65.4

*The percentages in these columns are calculated by excluding all of those who omitted the questions.

Results -- Strong Agreement

A considerable number of respondents seemed to AGREE or STRONGLY AGREE with the following four statements.

TABLE 5

Statements Which Elicited Considerable Agreement

Items	Percentage of Responses*		
	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total Agreement
7. I find that student ratings assist me to assess and improve my teaching	44.0	23.1	68.2
15. Student ratings are valid when supplemented by other sources of data	47.8	24.7	72.6
14. I would favor mandatory student ratings if validity could be demonstrated	44.4	29.6	73.8
22. Student ratings should be used to assist chairpersons (or others) to assist teachers	56.0	24.0	79.1

*The percentages in these columns are calculated by excluding all of those who omitted the question.

The very great (90.8%) majority of those people who responded to statement #20 agreed with the statement. This statement, "Student ratings should be used for teacher self-improvement," caused 45.2% of all respondents to mark the STRONGLY AGREE category.

Results--Types of Student Ratings Forms Used

Although the majority of respondents do not seem satisfied with the present use of student ratings, the type of form used doesn't seem to be the major problem. When asked to indicate the type of ratings questionnaire

which was used last term and the type which should be used, the following response pattern was elicited.

TABLE 6

The type of ratings form: (1) that was used last term; (2) that is most helpful, and (3) that is most likely to produce reliable and valid data for personnel decisions.

Form Type	% Responses (1) Was Used	(2) Most Helpful	(3) Most Valid
1. a "multiple-choice" questionnaire	28.4%	8.9%	12.8%
2. an "anecdotal" question form	14.0%	28.9%	12.6%
3. a form which has both types of question	44.3%	48.2%	44.3%
4. no questionnaire	9.4%	2.5%	9.2%
0. omit	3.9%	11.5%	21.1%

The decision as to who chooses the form to be used and who must solicit student ratings seems to vary. The following two tables present responses to questions concerned with who did (and should) decide upon the questionnaire to be used, and who is (and should be) asked to solicit student ratings.

TABLE 7

Responses to the question, "What group (or person) has decided (should decide) upon the questionnaire that was used?

Person or Group	% Response Did decide	Should Decide
1. no questionnaire used	3.0%	0.7%
2. the individual teacher	22.5%	26.6%
3. a departmental committee	44.0%	37.6%
4. the department chairperson	5.5%	1.6%
5. a college committee	8.0%	10.8%
6. other	9.2%	8.5%
0. omit	7.8%	14.5%

TABLE 8

Responses to the question(s): Who is asked (or required)--or should be asked--to solicit student ratings?

Person or Group	% Response Was Asked	Should be Asked
1. no faculty in department	8.9%	15.1%
2. untenured faculty	6.9%	3.7%
3. faculty facing tenure (or other personnel) decisions	8.3%	5.0%
4. all teaching faculty in the department	67.2%	61.2%
5. other	2.3%	2.1%
0. omit	6.4%	12.8%

Results--Who Should Judge Teaching Effectiveness?

Response patterns presented in preceding sections indicate that the majority of BGSU faculty and staff do not believe that, "students are the best judges of classroom instruction." Approximately 79% of those who responded to this statement disagreed with it--and over 42% were in strong disagreement. Since nearly 70% of respondents claimed to spend more than 50% of their time teaching (instead of performing research or service functions), and a similar number responded that they would wish their total performance evaluation to be weighted in favor of teaching, what teaching evaluation procedures are favored by the respondents? Table 9 presents the response distributions produced by questions asking about the best procedure to be used to measure classroom effectiveness.

TABLE 9

Responses to the questions:

I) Who (or what) is likely to be the best judge (or measure) of your classroom effectiveness?

II) Which is the second best judge or measure?

Response Options	% Responses I. Best Judge	II. Second Best
1. The students now in your class	21.6	10.6
2. A special subset of your students (e.g., "A" students, majors in your field, etc.)	8.9	8.9
3. Previous students	25.2	17.4
4. Faculty who also teach in your area	14.2	19.5
5. Faculty who have been asked to visit your class	4.6	7.3
6. Ratings by all (or most) of your department's faculty	0.9	4.4
7. The department (or area) chairperson	2.8	5.3
8. Scores achieved by your students on some standardized test	5.0	6.9
9. Other	8.9	1.6
Omit	7.6	18.1

Table 10 presents this same data in a manner to more clearly identify the preferred source of evaluation of classroom teaching effectiveness. Those who did not respond to a question are excluded from this analysis.

TABLE 10

A recoding of responses to questions: "Who is likely to be the best (second best) judge or measure of classroom teaching effectiveness?"

Judge or Measure	% Response Best Judge	Second Best
Students	60.5%	45.1%
Peers	21.4	38.1
Chairperson	3.0	6.4
Standard tests	5.5	8.4
Other	9.7	2.0

We seem to be presented with a paradox in which the majority of staff and faculty disagreed that "students are the best judges of classroom instruction," but students are preferred to other judges or measures of classroom teaching effectiveness by a majority of the same respondents. Part of this apparent paradox may be due to the inclusion of three definitions of "students" in Table 10 -- "the students now in your class", "a special subset of your students", and "previous students". Faculty who disagreed with the statement, "students are the best judges of classroom instruction," were probably referring to all "students now in your class" rather than to special subsets of current students or to former students.

III. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The committee finds that the following points are the most salient pieces of information to be gleaned from the report:

A. The faculty is generally dissatisfied with the current uses and practices by which students evaluate teaching.

B. The faculty does not favor any mandatory student ratings system, whether it be university-wide, college-wide, or department-wide. There is, however, less resistance to mandatory department-wide student rating procedures.

C. The faculty strongly agrees that student evaluations should be used for self-improvement.

D. The faculty strongly agrees that student ratings are valid assessments of teaching when supplemented by other sources of data.

The general dissatisfaction with student evaluations seems to augur severe morale problems. Complicating the problems further is the need to "do well" on student evaluation because of increasing probabilities of financial exigency. These factors could pressure faculty members into demanding less from their students in the hope of increasing ratings, a possibility which clearly violates the goals of a university committed to the pursuit of academic excellence. Therefore, the committee makes the following recommendations concerning the use of student evaluations of teaching:

A. Faculty members should provide, at least annually, evidence: (1) of teaching effectiveness; and (2) of attempts to improve teaching effectiveness. Evaluation by students is one method which should be utilized in gathering such evidence.

B. When faculty members desire to administer student evaluation forms for diagnostic and/or self-improvement purposes, they should be free to use any instrument and any administration procedure of their choice.

C. When a faculty member desires to submit the results of student evaluation for use in making personnel decisions (salary, promotion, or tenure), the following procedure must be followed:

1. The faculty member may choose the student evaluation instrument.

2. The instrument is to be administered to a majority of the faculty member's classes during the academic year in which he/she desires to be evaluated.

3. The student evaluation instrument must be administered during the last week of classes, with no prejudicial prefatory comments made by the faculty member to the students.

4. The evaluations are to be administered by a designated student who will distribute and collect them, and return them to the department chairperson's office.

5. The complete set of student evaluations is to be kept in department files for use by the department's personnel committee upon request of the faculty member. The file is open to examination by the faculty member at any time. Copies and all data should be provided to the faculty member as quickly as is possible. Any decisions must reflect the responses of all students who rated the teacher; however, the faculty member may choose to use evidence from as many or as few questions as he/she sees fit.

D. No stigma is to be attached to faculty members who elect not to administer student evaluation forms, so long as they are able to provide other forms of evidence regarding teaching effectiveness and attempts to improve effectiveness.

E. Department chairs and personnel committees should make use of student evaluations for assisting a faculty member to improve teaching effectiveness as well as for gathering evidence for personnel decisions.

While the major concern of the committee has been with student ratings of teaching effectiveness, general concern about improving teaching requires consideration of other methods of assessing and improving teaching skills. The committee recommends use of some or all of the following options to assist teachers to improve and/or to augment data gathered via student evaluation:

A. visits by a peer or by peers to the faculty member's classroom;

B. visits to a peer's classroom;

C. consultation with the chairman and/or department personnel committee;

D. videotaping or audiotaping teaching;

E. administering diagnostic student evaluation forms at midquarter (or more frequently) to promote improvements during the current quarter;

F. consulting with departmental colleagues or with tests and measurements experts regarding measurement procedures;

G. discussing teaching methods in department, college or university seminars, or at state or national conferences.

APPENDICES

A....Appendix A contains seven tables which categorize the questionnaire respondents.

B....Appendix B consists of the one-page interview form which was used with department chairs and members of personnel committees.

C....Appendix C consists of the six-page questionnaire which was mailed to all regular BGSU teaching faculty and associated staff.

D....Appendix D consists of a one-page request for copies of departmental rating forms.

E....Appendix E is the two-page abstract of the total report.

APPENDIX

Who Were the Respondents?

The 436 respondents are categorized in the following tables.

TABLE A

College Identification of Respondents

College	Frequency	Percentage
Arts and Sciences	210	48.6%
Business	51	11.8
Education	97	22.5
Health	3	0.7
Music	25	5.8
University (No College Association)	18	4.2
Firelands	12	2.8
Not BGSU (Two Year College Administrators)	16	3.7

TABLE B

Academic Rank of Respondents

Rank	Frequency	Percentage
Graduate Student	3	0.7%
Instructor	46	10.7
Assistant Professor	120	27.8
Associate Professor	129	29.9
Professor	118	27.4
Other	15	3.5

TABLE C

Administrative Status

Administrative Status	Frequency	Percentage
University Level Administrator	16	3.7%
College Level Administrator	24	5.5
Department Chairperson	28	6.4
Assistant Department Chairperson--Area Coordinator	54	12.4
Not an Administrator	289	66.3
Omit	25	5.7

TABLE D

Tenure Status

Tenure Status	Frequency	Percentage
Untenured (1 of 5 or 6 years)	44	10.1%
Untenured (2 of 5 or 6 years)	17	3.9
Untenured (3 of 5 or 6 years)	21	4.8
Untenured (4 of 5 or 6 years)	11	2.5
Untenured (5 of 5 or 6 years)	15	3.4
Granted tenure this year	19	4.4
Granted tenure last year	41	9.4
Received tenure within past 5 years	107	24.5
Received tenure over 5 years ago	142	32.6
Omit	19	4.4

TABLE E

Personnel Committee Membership

Status	Current Membership		Former Membership (past 3 years)	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
University Personnel/ Policy Committee	36	8.3%	30	6.9%
College Level Personnel Committee	45	10.3	39	8.9
Department Personnel Committee	97	22.2	83	19.0
Omit	258	59.2	284	65.1

The distribution of the respondents by department are indicated below.

TABLE F

Number and Percentage of
Respondents by Departmental Affiliation

Department	N	%	Department	N	%
Art	9	2	Management	8	2
Biology	19	5	Marketing	7	2
Business Education	4	1	Mathematics	20	5
Chemistry	9	2	Music Comp. & Hist.	6	1
College Student Personnel	2	-	Music Education	7	2
Computer Science	9	2	Music Perf.	12	3
Economics	8	2	Philosophy	9	2
Educ. Admin. & Super.	8	2	Phys. Ed. & Rec.	11	3
Educ. Curr. & Inst.	12	3	Physics	6	1
Educ. Found. & Inq.	16	4	Political Science	10	2
Educ. Special	6	1	Popular Culture	4	1
Educ. Stud. Tchg.	3	1	Psychology	24	6
English	24	6	Quant. Analysis & Con.	15	4
Finance & Insurance	1		Romance Lang.	10	2
Geography	9	2	Sociology	8	2
Geology	9	2	Speech	22	5
German-Russian	2	-	Military Science	2	-
Health & P.E.	15	4	Various Student Services; Residence Super., Counseling Ctr., Placement	8	2
History	13	3	IMC	1	-
Home Economics	13	3	Environmental Ed.	1	-
Industrial Ed. Tech.	11	3	Continuing Educ.	1	-
Journalism	6	1	Two-year College Administrators	16	4
Library & Ed. Media	2	-	Omitted designation	14	3
Library Services	4	1	Total N =	436	

TABLE G

Average Responses to Key Statements
by Categories of Respondents

Statements: (1) I favor a university-Wide, mandatory student ratings system.
(2) I favor a college-wide, mandatory student ratings system.
(3) I favor a department-wide student ratings system.

Key: 1 = strongly disagree 2 = disagree 3 - agree 4 - strongly agree

Category	Mean Response to Key Statements St. 1	St. 2	St. 3	N
ADMINISTRATIVE STATUS				
1. TEACHER (50% or more time devoted to teaching and not self-labeled as administrator	1.94	2.05	2.32	214
2. ADMINISTRATOR (self-labeled as an administrator and 40% or less time devoted to teaching)	2.37	2.42	2.65	43
"t" test value and degrees of freedom	2.31 (1,257)	2.0 (1,255)	1.73 (1,259)	
TENURE STATUS				
1. Untenured, year 1 or 2	2.35	2.55	2.90	60
2. Untenured, nearing tenure	2.34	2.51	2.66	47
3. Recently tenured	2.03	2.09	2.46	57
4. Tenured for 2+ years	1.81	1.86	2.14	241
"F" value and degrees of freedom	5.71 (3,404)	9.77 (3,401)	8.77 (3,400)	
PERSONNEL COMMITTEE STATUS				
1. Not a member within past 3 years	2.08	2.17	2.40	187
2. Current or recent membership	1.94	2.01	2.34	233
"t" value and degrees of freedom	1.29 (1,424)	1.48 (1,419)	0.54 (1,418)	

It appears that recently hired and untenured teachers and administrators are slightly more favorable toward mandatory student ratings than are tenured teachers. Surprisingly, current or recent membership on various personnel and policy committees has little effect upon attitudes toward mandatory student ratings--and such membership is quite widely distributed since 53% of (233 of 436) respondents have claimed current or recent membership on university, college or departmental level personnel/policy committees.

Appendix B

Questionairre for Chairpersons

1. In your opinion, what are the present functions of student ratings in your department?

2. What additional functions would you like to see student ratings serve? (PST evaluation of teaching, feedback for teacher, research purposes, assign courses to teachers)

3. What student rating forms are now used within your department? (attach form)

4. How were these forms chosen?

5. Are faculty members obligated to use these forms? (How much discretion does a faculty member have with the use of such forms?)

6. What procedures are used for administering the forms and how, if at all, are these procedures mandated?

7. What supervision, collection and storage procedures exist?

8. What information on the rating forms does your committee look at?

9. Is the data analyzed numerically? Are there anecdotal comments? Is there an overall rating?

10. Who in the department is given access to this data?

11. in what forms are the data presented?

12. For these personnel decisions, what data is presented, in what forms and what weightings to the following:

reappointment	promotion	tenure	salary	job assignment	
					chairperson
					personnel comm.
					dept. members (self)
					dept. members (others)
					outside dept. - Provost, etc.

13. How much weight is given to student ratings in the teaching component of ratings?

14. How much weight is given to teaching in each faculty member's total rating, among teaching, research, and service?

15. In your opinion, how effectively do you feel the present rating forms help you differentiate between good and bad teaching?

16. How satisfied are members of your department with your student rating system?

BGSU FACULTY ATTITUDES TOWARD STUDENT RATINGS

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee and the Faculty Welfare Committee have created an ad hoc committee to determine the current uses of student ratings and to assess faculty attitudes toward ratings. The information provided by this survey is part of this SEC study. Please add your own responses whenever these questions seem inadequate. All responses will remain anonymous. Thank you for your assistance.

Refold this form and return it through Campus Mail to: RATINGS, Faculty Senate.

I. General Background Information

(1-2) 1. Your department _____.

(3) 2. Your college _____.

3. Your academic rank (check best description).

(4)
_____ 1. Undergraduate Student
_____ 2. Graduate Student
_____ 3. Graduate Teaching Assistant
_____ 4. Instructor
_____ 5. Assistant Professor
_____ 6. Associate Professor
_____ 7. Full Professor
_____ 8. Other _____

4. Administrative status (check one):

(5)
_____ 1. University level administrator
_____ 2. College level administrator
_____ 3. Department chairperson
_____ 4. Assistant department chairperson (or program coordinator or administrator)
_____ 5. I am not an administrator

5. Tenure status:

(6)
_____ 1. Untenured (1 of 5 (6))
_____ 2. Untenured (2 of 5 (6))
_____ 3. Untenured (3 of 5 (6))
_____ 4. Untenured (4 of 5 (6))
_____ 5. Untenured (5 of 5 (6))
_____ 6. Granted tenure this year
_____ 7. Granted tenure last year
_____ 8. Received tenure within past five years
_____ 9. Received tenure over five years ago

6. Policy Committee Membership (Please indicate your past and/or current committee memberships by checking the appropriate descriptors.)

	Current Membership		Former Membership (within past three years)	
(7)	_____ 1.	University-level Personnel/Policy Committee	_____ 1.	(8)
	_____ 2.	College-level Personnel/Policy Committee	_____ 2.	
	_____ 3.	Department-level Personnel/Policy Committee	_____ 3.	

7. How do you <u>presently</u> distribute your time and effort among the three major faculty functions of: (1) Teaching; (2) Research (or scholarly productivity); and (3) Service (to BGSU, to your discipline, to the community, as an administrator, etc.)? Circle the appropriate percentages (the three functions should total to 100%).

	Teaching	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%
(9)	Research	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%
	Service	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%

8. How would you <u>like</u> to distribute your time and effort among these three functions? (Circle appropriate percentages to total 100%).

	Teaching	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%
(10)	Research	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%
	Service	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%

9. If you were to be evaluated as to your effectiveness in these three areas, how would you like these functions <u>to be weighted</u>? (Circle to total to 100%)

	Teaching	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%
(11)	Research	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%
	Service	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%

10. How would <u>you</u> like the following measures of teaching to be weighted? (Circle to total to 100%).

	Student ratings	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%
	Peer ratings	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%
(12)	Administrator ratings	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%
	Class load, advisee load, etc.	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%
	Other measures	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%

II. Indicate your agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements by circling the appropriate number -- using this scale:

1 = SD = strongly disagree
2 = D = disagree
3 = A = agree
4 = SA = strongly agree

		Strongly Disagree			Strongly Agree
(13)	1. I favor a university-wide, mandatory student ratings system	1	2	3	4
(14)	2. I favor a college-wide, mandatory student ratings system	1	2	3	4
(15)	3. I favor a department-wide, mandatory student ratings system	1	2	3	4
(16)	4. Decisions concerning the use of student ratings should be made solely by the individual departments	1	2	3	4
(17)	5. Decisions concerning the use of student ratings should be made solely by individual faculty	1	2	3	4
(18)	6. I am satisfied with the present use of student ratings	1	2	3	4
(19)	7. I find that student ratings assist me to assess and improve my teaching.	1	2	3	4
(20)	8. Only numerical data derived from student ratings should be provided to personnel committees	1	2	3	4
(21)	9. Only anecdotal information derived from student ratings should be provided to personnel committees.	1	2	3	4
(22)	10. Student ratings data are not weighted heavily enough in making most personnel decisions.	1	2	3	4
(23)	11. Students are the best judges of classroom instruction	1	2	3	4

			Strongly Disagree			Strongly Agree
(24)	12.	Student ratings are <u>not</u> valid measures of classroom teaching competence	1	2	3	4
(25)	13.	Student ratings should <u>not</u> be used to determine faculty dismissal.	1	2	3	4
(26)	14.	I would favor mandatory student ratings if validity could be demonstrated. .	1	2	3	4
(27)	15.	Student ratings are valid when supplemented by other sources of data	1	2	3	4
(28)	16.	Student ratings are valid only when signed by students	1	2	3	4
(29)	17.	Student ratings <u>are now</u> used to inform students about teacher or course characteristics.	1	2	3	4
(30)	18.	Student ratings <u>should be</u> used to inform students about teacher/course characteristics	1	2	3	4
(31)	19.	Student ratings <u>are now</u> used for teacher self-improvement	1	2	3	4
(32)	20.	Student ratings <u>should be</u> used for teacher self-improvement	1	2	3	4
(33)	21.	Student ratings <u>are now</u> used to assist chairpersons (or others) to assist teachers	1	2	3	4
(34)	22.	Student ratings <u>should be</u> used to assist chairpersons (or others) to assist teachers	1	2	3	4
(35)	23.	Student ratings <u>are now</u> used as a <u>necessary</u> component of personnel decisions	1	2	3	4
(36)	24.	Student ratings <u>should be</u> used as a <u>necessary</u> component of personnel decisions	1	2	3	4

III. Teaching Evaluation Techniques

1. What type of student ratings questionnaire did you use last term? (Check or circle the best descriptor)

(37)
_____ 1. A "multiple-choice" questionnaire
_____ 2. An "anecdotal" question (open-ended questions) form
_____ 3. A form which provides both types of questions
_____ 4. No student ratings questionnaire

2. Which type of form (above) is most helpful to you in your
(38) teaching? # _____

3. Which type of questionnaire is most likely to produce reliable
(39) and valid data to support personnel decisions? # _____

4. What group (or person) has decided upon the questionnaire that was used?

_____ 1. No questionnaire used
_____ 2. The individual teacher
(40) _____ 3. A departmental committee
_____ 4. The department chairman
_____ 5. A college committee
_____ 6. Other _____

5. Which group or person (above) should determine the questionnaire to be
(41) used? # _____

6. Who is asked (or required) to solicit student ratings?

_____ 1. No faculty in the department
_____ 2. Untenured faculty
(42) _____ 3. Faculty facing tenure (or other personnel) decisions
_____ 4. All teaching faculty in the department
_____ 5. Other _____

7. Which faculty should be asked to solicit student ratings and provide
(43) the results to the department? # _____

8. Who (or what) is likely to be the best judge (or measure) of your classroom teaching effectiveness?

_____ 1. The students now in your class
_____ 2. A special subset of your students (e.g. "A" students, majors in your field, etc.)
_____ 3. Previous students
(44) _____ 4. Faculty who also teach in your area
_____ 5. Faculty who have been asked to visit your class
_____ 6. Ratings by all (or most) of your department's faculty
_____ 7. The department (or area) chairperson
_____ 8. Scores achieved by your students on some standardized test
_____ 9. Other _____

(45) 9. Which is the second best judge or measure (above)? # _____

Comments concerning the present use of student ratings:

Comments concerning the ideal use of student ratings:

Other:

Appendix D

Bowling Green State University

Department of Educational
Foundations & Inquiry
Bowling Green, Ohio 43403

January 31, 1977

MEMORANDUM

TO: Department Chair

FROM: Peter Wood
EDFI Department

RE: Forms Used by Your Departments in the Student Rating of Faculty Teaching

A five-member, ad hoc committee to determine faculty attitudes toward and uses of student ratings of BGSU faculty has just completed its report to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. If you would send to me a copy of the student rating form(s) used in your department, these forms could be included in the Appendices of the Report. Thank you.

jgml/4

Appendix E

ABSTRACT

Student Ratings: BGSU Uses of and Faculty Attitudes Toward Student Evaluation of Teachers and Courses

Robert Guion, Psychology
Peter Hutchinson, Economics
Tom Klein, English
Joyce Stutz, Computer Science
Peter Wood, Educational Foundations, Chair

During the Spring term of 1976, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee created an ad hoc committee to determine current uses and faculty attitudes toward student evaluation of classes and teachers. Interviews with department chairs and members of college personnel committees, and the responses of 420 faculty and staff to a questionnaire, provide the information presented in this report.

Interviews with department chairs identified a wide range of instruments being used for student evaluations of instruction. No one form was found to be in uniform use across departments. Such uniform use had been the practice in the College of Business Administration, but it was discontinued prior to the completion of this survey.

Both computer-scored multiple-choice questionnaires and forms eliciting open responses have been used; most departments combined the two formats. Most forms permitted students to remain anonymous and provided space for general comments. In most departments, some type of summary information describing each class was made available and, in many, a numerical summary became part of the faculty member's personnel file.

For varying reasons, student evaluation forms are used in most departments. Although they vary widely in style and content, their administration seems to follow a common pattern. Little else, however, is consistent across departments. Some departments mandate the use of student evaluation form. Others do so only on a limited basis, while still others either do not do so at all or do so only for probationary faculty. There is also wide diversity in access to the ratings. The faculty member, of course, usually is informed--although sometimes not until the end of the school year. Chairs generally also have access to the results. Department secretaries or members of various personnel committees may have access to results. Sometimes results are sent, intact, to deans or college personnel committees. Occasionally, they are open to all departmental faculty, with teachers either clearly identified or coded, to permit comparisons.

There is no consistent pattern concerning the weight this information might have in the evaluation of teaching, nor is there uniformity in the weight given to teaching in relation to research or service.

In general, the chairs sensed faculty concerns over the reliabilities and validities of these forms, particularly in relation to their use for personnel decisions. The chairs' perceptions of their faculty attitude covered the gamut from saying that most faculty favored dropping the use of student evaluation forms to saying that all faculty should be required to use them. Several chairs considered the ratings useful to them only for identifying faculty members at the extremes of teaching ability.

In a second stage of the committee's work, a 55-item questionnaire was used to assess faculty attitudes and practices related to the uses of student ratings. There is general faculty disapproval of college or university-wide mandatory student rating systems; there is less general disapproval, although still disapproval, over departmental mandate. Most faculty seem to favor some sort of use of student ratings in personnel decisions, but the most favored use is for faculty self-improvement. This is true even though there is some question as to how well students can judge classroom instruction.

The committee concludes that faculty dissatisfaction with student evaluation of instruction, coupled with pressures to "do well" on them, suggests the possibility of severe morale problems which could lead some faculty to reduce their demands for excellence in student performance. The committee therefore makes a series of explicit recommendations which, in brief, ask that evidences of both: (1) teaching effectiveness; and (2) evident attempts to improve effectiveness be sought--but that great individual freedom be encouraged in the forms which such evidence might take.